



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/765,756

01/27/2004

Robert James Salmi

1370.065US1

1941

21186

7590

03/16/2011

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.

P.O. BOX 2938

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

DAILEY, THOMAS J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2452

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/16/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com

request@slwip.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/765,756	Applicant(s) SALMI ET AL.	
	Examiner THOMAS J. DAILEY	Art Unit 2452	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/30/2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-50 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. The 35 USC 101 rejections directed at claims 40-50 have been withdrawn in view of the entered amendments.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejections of the claims 1-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odiaka (US Pat. 6,829,347) in view of Brawn et al (US Pat. 7,020,718), hereafter "Brawn," in further view of Naveh et al (US Pat. 6,466,984), hereafter "Naveh."
6. As to claim 1, Odiaka discloses a computer-implemented method comprising:

to parameterize a routing policy, wherein the parameterizing includes identifying one or more common blocks of policy statements within the routing policy (column 7, lines 1-27 and column 7, Table 1; the system comprises a different "policy profiles" (e.g. table 1) comprised of "Data Fields" and "Values", which read on the claimed "*policy statements*"), the common blocks of policy statements sharing a similar structure (column 7, lines 1-27 and column 7, Table 1; each of the plurality of profiles comprise common "Data Fields" ("*common structure*")), and

assigning sets of parameters to elements of the one or more common blocks, at least one common block being re-used with a different assigned set of parameters (column 7, lines 1-27 and column 7, Table 1; different policy profiles will have a different assigned values (i.e. "*different assigned set of parameters*") for each of the "Data Fields" (i.e. *reused common blocks*)); and

applying the parameterized-routing policy to a route (column 6, lines 54-59, policy profile with defined parameters is applied to a new trail (route)).

But, Odiaka does not explicitly disclose enabling a hierarchical arrangement of the one or more common blocks of policy statements within the routing policy.

However, Brawn discloses a hierarchical arrangement of common blocks of policy statements within routing policies (column 9, lines 3-11; repeating policy patterns (i.e., they would contain common blocks) are assigned to route aggregation points at each hierarchy (i.e., they can be arranged hierarchically)).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brawn and Odiaka in order to reduce complexity by arranging/applying routing policies in a hierarchical manner.

But, neither Odiaka nor Brawn explicitly disclose the policy statements include being an attribute-operand pairing. More specifically, Odiaka does not explicitly disclose operands in the policy statements.

However, Naveh discloses a policy based network management method including policy statements which comprise attribute and operator pairings (column 15, lines 21-30; "Each condition comprises a parameter, an operator, and an operand").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Odiaka and Brawn with Naveh in order to extend the system to policies driven by attribute and operand based policies thereby creating a broader market for the routing method.

7. As to claims 14, 27, and 40, they are rejected by a similar rationale to that set forth in claim 1's rejection.
8. As to claims 2, 15, 28, and 41 Odiaka, discloses the routing policy comprises a plurality of policy statements (column 6, lines 60-63, editor screen lists various parameters which can be selected and configured), and wherein the processor is to assign parameters to at least some of the policy statements and is to refrain

Art Unit: 2452

from assigning parameters to at least some other of the policy statements to generate the parameterized-routing policy (column 7, lines 1-7, user controls may control parameter assignment; column 7, Table 1 list various parameters associated with policy statements; all policy statements need not have parameters, see for example "Balancing Mode...No-Adjustment"), and wherein the processor is to store the assigned parameters in the storage element (column 6, lines 60-63).

9. As to claims 3, 16, 29, and 42, Odiaka discloses for the routing policy, generating at least one parameterized-policy statement having an associated set of parameters for one of either a customer or customer class (column 4, lines 42-43).
10. As to claims 4, 17, 30, and 43, Odiaka discloses the routing policy comprises a plurality of policy statements, each policy statement having one or more differing values associated with one or more customers or customer classes (column 6, lines 60-63 and column 7, Table 1), and wherein the processor is to assign parameters to the one or more differing values of the policy statements (column 7, Table 1).
11. As to claims 5, 18, 31, and 45, Odiaka discloses storing the parameter sets in a parameter table, the table associating each set of parameters with either a

Art Unit: 2452

customer or a customer class (column 7, Table 1; further column 7, lines 17-26, defines various default policies based upon customer needs).

12. As to claims 6, 19, 32, and 47, Odiaka discloses parameterizing further comprises reusing the common blocks in the parameterized-routing policy (column 7, Table 1 and column 7, lines 17-26, i.e. class of service/default profiles)

13. As to claims 7, 20, 33, and 48, Odiaka discloses parameterizing further comprises reusing the common blocks in another parameterized-routing policy (column 7, Table 1 and column 7, lines 17-26, i.e. class of service/default profiles).

14. As to claims 8, 21, and 34, Odiaka discloses calling a parameterized policy with parameters from the parameter table based on one of either the customer or the customer class (column 7, Table 1 and column 7, lines 17-26, i.e. class of service profile (customer class)).

15. As to claims 9, 22, 35, and 49, Odiaka discloses determining at least one of whether to accept the route (column 6, lines 60-63).

Art Unit: 2452

16. As to claims 10, 23, and 36, Odiaka discloses when the route is accepted or modified, applying further comprises installing the accepted or the modified route (column 6, lines 60-63).

17. As to claims 11, 24, and 37, Odiaka discloses modifying attributes of the route, wherein modifying comprises at least one of changing an attribute (column 6, lines 60-63).

18. As to claims 12, 25, 38, and 50, Odiaka discloses:

identifying one or more common blocks of policy statements, the common blocks being common to more than one routing policy (column 7, lines 9-26 and column 7, Table 1; default values read on common blocks);

generating a commonized routing policy from the one or more common blocks (column 7, lines 9-26 and column 7, Table 1; default values read on common blocks); and

reusing the commonized routing policy by calling the commonized routing policy from within the more than one routing policy which uses the common blocks (column 7, lines 9-26 and column 7, Table 1; default values read on common blocks; a profile may be reused for different trails (routes)).

19. As to claims 13, 26, and 39, Odiaka discloses assigning parameters to at least some of the policy statements of the common blocks to parameterize at least

some policy statements in the common blocks (column 7, lines 9-26 and column 7, Table 1).

20. As to claim 44, Odiaka discloses parameterizing comprises assigning parameters to the one or more differing values of the policy statements (column 7, Table 1).

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2452

571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday;
9:00am - 5:00pm.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice L Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/T. J. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2452